UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,959	08/22/2003	Michael Wayne Brown	AUS920010819US2	8404

34533 7590 04/01/2008

INTERNATIONAL CORP (BLF)
c/o BIGGERS & OHANIAN, LLP
P.O. BOX 1469
AUSTIN, TX 78767-1469

EXAMINER	
PATEL, HEMANT SHANTILAL	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2614	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/01/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/645,959	BROWN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	HEMANT PATEL	2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 March 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-17,19-23,25-29,31 and 32* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-17,19-23,25-29,31 and 32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's submission filed on March 18, 2008 in response to an Office Action dated December 19, 2007 has been entered. Claims 1-17, 19-23, 25-29, 31-32 are pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed March 18, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3. **Regarding claim 31 rejection as anticipated by Harris,** the Applicant has argued (Remarks, pg. 18) that "Harris's interactive voice response applications that may offer spoken menu selection choices which are sent to the service provider with confirmation of user identity do not disclose controlling output of said authenticated caller identity from said telephony device, such that an individual with access to said telephony device is informed of the identity of said caller, as claimed in the present application. Harris's 'service provider' is not an individual with access to said telephone device.". The Examiner respectfully disagrees. As described in the rejections in previous Office Action, Harris teaches of controlling output of authenticated caller identity in two different manners. Harris (col. 3 ll. 49-50) clearly teaches of controlling output of failed authentication of caller identity through caller telephony device as "If the voices do not match, the user is either asked to try again or is denied access to the service provider's system". Further, Harris (col. 3 ll. 53-56) clearly teaches of controlling output of authenticated caller identity through caller telephony device as "In addition to confirming

user identity, service provider systems may offer spoken menu selection choices". These choices are offered to the user who as a caller initiates incoming call with a toll-free phone call (Harris, col. 3 ll. 28-30, 62-63).

4. **Regarding claim 31 rejection with combination of Farris and Bajwa,** the Applicant has argued (Remarks, pg. 36) that "Farris's called party has access to the called party's telephone - not, the telephone that the caller used.". The Examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the telephone that the caller used) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The claim is broad in scope interpreted as follows:

receiving, from a trusted telephone network, an authenticated caller identity for a caller (receiving authenticated caller identity for a caller that was sent in IAM message by the trusted telephone network) at a telephony device (receiving at a called telephony device in the form of caller ID), wherein said caller identity is authenticated at a authentication service accessible via a network external to said trusted telephone network (this caller identity is also authenticated by authentication server accessible to trusted telephone network), wherein said trusted telephone network, initiates said authentication service (and this authentication is initiated by trusted telephone network); and

controlling output of said authenticated caller identity from said telephony device (controlling the output, of received authenticated caller identity, by displaying the received caller ID), such that an individual with access to said telephony device is informed of the identity of said caller (such that called party with access to said called telephony device is informed of caller identity).

This claim limitation of controlling output is clearly taught by Farris (col. 21 ll. 36-col. 22 ll.51).

For the benefit of the Applicant, the above detailed explanations are repeated in the rejections for claim 31 below.

5. **Regarding claims 1-32 rejection with combination of Farris and Bajwa,** the Applicant has made general arguments (Remarks, pgs. 40-41) with regards to factual inquiries with respect to *Graham vs. John Deer Co.* citing *"Graham* factors: (1) the scope and content of the prior art, (2) the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art, and (3) the level of ordinary skill in the art", and "In particular in this case, the Examiner has not ascertained the differences between the prior art and the claims in issue. In the office action, the Examiner has only identified elements in Applicants' claims not found in one reference and then attempted to find a similar element in another to support an obviousness rejection.", "Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue requires interpreting the claim language, and considering both the invention and the prior art references as a whole.", "Furthermore, "[i]n determining the differences between the prior art and the claims, the question under 35 U.S.C. 103 is not whether the differences themselves would have been

obvious, but whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious."". The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Applicant has made a broad generalized allegations but has not identified any particular claim or claim limitation for which these factual inquires were not performed. The Office Action clearly indicated the scope and content of the prior art as it applied to claimed limitations (limitations taught by Farris), the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art (the limitations not taught by the prior art reference i.e. what Farris does not specifically teach). With regards to "as a whole" obviousness, the claimed invention is an external server providing authentication of a caller identity of a caller calling from a telephone at a trusted telephone network, this authentication is initiated by the trusted telephone network by brokering connection to this external server, and the authenticated identity specifies services available to the caller. Farris clearly teaches of receiving a call from a caller calling from a telephone to central office (trusted telephone network), central office brokers connection to an external server (IP), external server (IP) performs authentication and provides authenticated identity to central office and this identity specifies the services available to the caller. Farris teaches all the limitations but the Applicant had argued about the IP as an external server. For this Office has shown Bajwa that teaches of using an external server for authenticating caller identity wherein the caller using the telephone makes a call through central office (trusted telephone network), the connection from caller through central office is brokered to an external server (feature platform) which performs caller identity authentication and this

authenticated identity specifies the services available to the caller. Thus, both Farris and Bajwa as a whole teach the similar inventions obvious as claimed by the applicant.

6. Further, regarding the level of ordinary skill in the art, the Applicant has made general arguments (Remarks, pg. 41) "The examiner must ascertain what would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, and not to the inventor, a judge, a layman, those skilled in remote arts, or to geniuses in the art at hand", and for this the Applicant further states that "Factors that may be considered in determining level of ordinary skill in the art include (1) the educational level of the inventor; (2) type of problems encountered in the art; (3) prior art solutions to those problems; (4) rapidity with which innovations are made; (5) sophistication of the technology; and (6) educational level of active workers in the field." The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Applicant has indicated exclusion of "inventor, a judge, a layman, those skilled in remote arts, or to geniuses in the art at hand" as one of ordinary skill in the art, but the Applicant has not identified who is actually included in the list of one of ordinary skill in the art. Further, regarding the factors listed to determine the one of ordinary skill in the art, the Applicant has not specified the necessary information, i.e. specific education levels required for the inventor and workers in the field, the scale of rapidity with which innovations are made, or the level of sophistication of the technology.

7. The Supreme Court in *KSR International co. v. Teleflex Inc.* has stated that "A person of ordinary skill is also a person of ordinary creativity, not an automaton.", "Common sense teaches, however, that familiar items may have obvious uses beyond

their primary purposes, and in many cases a person of ordinary skill will be able to fit the teachings of multiple patents together like pieces of a puzzle.", "…inventions in most, if not all, instances rely upon building blocks long since uncovered, and claimed discoveries almost of necessity will be combinations of what, in some sense, is already known.", "The obviousness analysis cannot be confined by a formalistic conception of the words teaching, suggestion, and motivation, or by overemphasis on the importance of published articles and the explicit content of issued patents. The diversity of inventive pursuits and of modern technology counsels against limiting the analysis in this way.", "When there is a design need or market pressure to solve a problem and there are a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp. If this leads to the anticipated success, it is likely the product not of innovation but of ordinary skill and common sense. In that instance the fact that a combination was obvious to try might show that it was obvious under §103.", and "There is flexibility in our obviousness jurisprudence because a motivation may be found implicitly in the prior art. We do not have a rigid test that requires an actual teaching to combine . . .". In the instant case, Farris and Bajwa have explicitly taught these pieces of puzzle and Bajwa further explicitly specified the motivation for an external server "to provide the functionality of feature services such as authentication without the cost and complexity of duplicating resources in multiple places" (Bajwa, Paragraph 0007) since "It is easier to change one or more centralized locations rather than each of the gateways in the system for modifications, upgrade, maintenance and expansion" (Bajwa, Paragraph 0017).

Response to Amendment

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17, 19-23, 25-29, 32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The rejections are necessitated due to claim amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Harris (US Patent No. 6,535,582 B1).

Regarding claim 31, Harris teaches of a method for controlling caller identification, comprising:

receiving, from a trusted telephone network, an authenticated caller identity for a caller at a telephony device (Fig. 1, item 30; col. 3, ll. 46-48; receiving an authenticated caller identity notification at a service provider device in the telephone network), wherein said caller identity is authenticated at a authentication service accessible via a network external to said trusted telephone network (Fig. 1, item 2; Figs. 2-3, items 56, 57

external central server accessed via Internet), wherein said trusted telephone network initiates said authentication service (col. 3, ll. 28-38; telephone network through IVR initiates authentication by the external central server); and

controlling output of said authenticated caller identity from said telephony device, such that an individual with access to said telephony device is informed of the identity of said caller (col. 4, ll. 43-47; connecting to customer service representative with verified notification; col. 6, ll. 20-45; providing confirmed identity of an offender to court representative).

Regarding claim 31, Harris teaches of a method for controlling caller identification, comprising:

receiving, from a trusted telephone network, an authenticated caller identity for a caller at a telephony device (Fig. 1, item 30; col. 3, ll. 49-50; receiving a failed authenticated caller identity by the user), wherein said caller identity is authenticated at a authentication service accessible via a network external to said trusted telephone network (Fig. 1, item 2; Figs. 2-3, items 56, 57 external central server accessed via Internet), wherein said trusted telephone network initiates said authentication service (col. 3, ll. 28-38; telephone network through IVR initiates authentication by the external central server); and

controlling output of said authenticated caller identity from said telephony device, such that an individual with access to said telephony device is informed of the identity of said caller (col. 3, ll. 49-50, controlling output of the said failed authenticated identity in the form of asking the user to try again as "If the voices do not match, the user is either

asked to try again or is denied access to the service provider's system"; col. 3, ll. 53-56, controlling output of authenticated caller identity through caller telephony device as "In addition to confirming user identity, service provider systems may offer spoken menu selection choices". These choices are offered to the user who as a caller initiates incoming call with a toll-free phone call col. 3 ll. 28-30, 62-63).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

13. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farris (US Patent No. 6,122,357), and further in view of Bajwa (US Patent Application Publication No. 2007/0058787 A1).

Regarding claim 31, Farris teaches of a method for controlling caller identification, comprising:

receiving, from a trusted telephone network, an authenticated caller identity for a caller (receiving authenticated caller identity for a caller that was sent in IAM message by the trusted telephone network) at a telephony device (receiving at a called telephony device in the form of caller ID) (col. 18, ll. 22-col. 20, ll. 32; col. 21, ll. 36-col. 22, ll. 18), wherein said caller identity is authenticated at a authentication service accessible via a network external to said trusted telephone network (this caller identity is also authenticated by authentication server accessible to trusted telephone network) (Fig. 1, item 23, IP Remote; col. 11, ll. 42-54), wherein said trusted telephone network initiates said authentication service (and this authentication is initiated by trusted telephone network) (col. 18, ll. 22-col. 20, ll. 49); and

controlling output of said authenticated caller identity from said telephony device (controlling the output, of received authenticated caller identity, by displaying the received caller ID), such that an individual with access to said telephony device is informed of the identity of said caller (such that called party with access to said called telephony device is informed of caller identity) (col. 21, ll. 36-col. 22, ll. 51).

Farris is silent on terming the IP providing authentication service as being external server, and the Applicant has relied on Farris col. 11, ll. 1-4 where Farris notes that "The preferred telephone network also includes one or more intelligent peripherals (IPs) 23 to provide enhanced announcement and digits collection capabilities and speech recognition" to argue that the IP providing authentication service in Farris is not

an external server. The functionalities of announcements and digit collection for automatic call completion to a retrieved telephone number by a directory assistance center are common in the third party provided service like directory assistance. The third party server providing directory assistance is *included in the telephone network* for providing service to its customers *but still is external server* not owned and operated by the telephone service provider operating the trusted telephone network. Thus, providing a particular service by an intelligent peripheral is not an indicator to show the inclusion or exclusion of the peripheral in a network. The externality of IP as external server is further evident from the Farris' disclosure that SCP specifically communicates with IP over separate signaling network 27 (TCP/IP network) (Farris, col. 11, ll. 21-30; col. 19, ll. 16-24) in contrast to SCP communicating with other trusted telephone network components like SSP, STP over trusted network of CCIS using SS7 protocols (Farris, col. 9, ll. 20-55).

However, in the same field of endeavor, Bajwa teaches of a method to provide authentication service from a feature server (an external server) on a packet-based network connecting through a gateway to a user origin device in a trusted telephone network and provide various services based on user or user device authentication (Figs. 2-3; Paragraphs 0015-0030).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Farris to provide user authentication and other services based on this user authentication from a central feature server as taught by Bajwa in order to "provide the functionality of feature services such as authentication without the

cost and complexity of duplicating resources in multiple places" (Bajwa, Paragraph 0007) so that it "allows each of the gateways to be less complex and easier to maintain" and "It is easier to change one or more centralized locations rather than each of the gateways in the system for modifications, upgrade, maintenance and expansion" (Bajwa, Paragraph 0017).

14. Claims 1-17, 19-23, 25-29, 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farris, and further in view of Bajwa, and further in view of Bassenyemukasa (US Patent No. 5,623,539).

Regarding claim 1, Farris teaches of a method for specifying telephone services for a particular caller, comprising:

detecting a call initiation condition from an origin device at a trusted telephone network (col. 18, ll. 8-14);

brokering a connection between said origin device and an external server enabled to perform a caller identity authentication service (col. 18, ll. 22-col. 19, ll. 5, switch brokering connection between off hook line and IP);

responsive to receiving, from said external server, an authenticated caller identity of a caller utilizing said origin device, specifying services available to said caller according to said authenticated caller identity (col. 20, ll. 6-49, IP authenticating caller and providing virtual ID of authenticated caller which is used to load specific subscriber service profile).

Farris is silent on terming the IP providing authentication service as being external server, and the Applicant has relied on Farris col. 11, ll. 1-4 where Farris notes that "The preferred telephone network also includes one or more intelligent peripherals (IPs) 23 to provide enhanced announcement and digits collection capabilities and speech recognition" to argue that the IP providing authentication service in Farris is not an external server. The functionalities of announcements and digit collection for automatic call completion to a retrieved telephone number by a directory assistance center are common in the third party provided service like directory assistance. The third party server providing directory assistance is *included in the telephone network* for providing service to its customers *but still is external server* not owned and operated by the telephone service provider operating the trusted telephone network. Thus, providing a particular service by an intelligent peripheral is not an indicator to show the inclusion or exclusion of the peripheral in a network. The externality of IP as external server is further evident from the Farris' disclosure that SCP specifically communicates with IP over separate signaling network 27 (TCP/IP network) (Farris, col. 11, ll. 21-30; col. 19, ll. 16-24) in contrast to SCP communicating with other trusted telephone network components like SSP, STP over trusted network of CCIS using SS7 protocols (Farris, col. 9, ll. 20-55), and Farris does not teach of automatically initiating recording of said call in response to lack of identity as indicated by authenticated caller identity.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Bajwa teaches of a method of detecting a call initiation condition from an origin device at a trusted telephone network (Paragraph 0018 call received through central office); brokering connection between

origin device and an external server to perform caller identity authentication service (Paragraphs 0018-0019 call is connected to feature platform); responsive to receiving, from said external server, an authenticated caller identity of caller utilizing said origin device, specifying services available to said caller according to said authenticated caller identity (Paragraphs 0019-0020, 0022, 0024-0030, provide authentication service from a feature server (an external server) to provide various services based on user or user device authentication).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Farris to provide user authentication and other services based on this user authentication from a central feature server as taught by Bajwa in order to “provide the functionality of feature services such as authentication without the cost and complexity of duplicating resources in multiple places" (Bajwa, Paragraph 0007) so that it "allows each of the gateways to be less complex and easier to maintain" and "It is easier to change one or more centralized locations rather than each of the gateways in the system for modifications, upgrade, maintenance and expansion” (Bajwa, Paragraph 0017).

Farris and Bajwa do not teach of automatically initiating recording of call in response to lack of identity as indicated by authenticated caller identity.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Bassenyemukasa teaches of a method of detecting a call initiation condition from an origin device at a trusted telephone network (col. 5 ll. 61-66); brokering connection between origin device and an external server to perform caller identity authentication service (col. 5 ll. 38-42 connection from

originating line to stand-alone external adjunct); responsive to receiving, from said external server, an authenticated caller identity of caller utilizing said origin device, specifying services available to said caller according to said authenticated caller identity (col. 5 ll. 64-col. 6 ll. 3 monitoring caller voice to indicate “valid” or “not valid”; col. 7 ll. 10-62 different call services); and responsive to said caller identity indicating a lack of identity (authenticated as lacking a valid identity), automatically initiating recording of said call (col. 7 ll. 21-36).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Farris and Bajwa to initiate recording of a call when the user is identified as lacking valid identity as taught by Bassenyemukasa in order to “monitor a conversation in a delayed mode where the conversation is stored and subject to later analysis for fraudulent use of the phone line" (Bassenyemukasa, col. 7 ll. 60-62).

Regarding claim 2, Farris teaches of the method wherein said server is accessible via a network outside said trusted telephone network (Fig. 1, item 23, IP is outside of network and is accessed via T1, SMDI or PRI; col. 11, ll. 10-20, ll. 42-54). Bajwa teaches of feature server accessible via network outside trusted telephone network (Paragraph 0018-0020).

Regarding claim 3, Farris teaches of the method further comprising:

retrieving a caller profile for said authenticated caller identity (col. 20, ll. 6-49, IP authenticating caller and providing virtual ID which is used to load specific subscriber service profile); and

specifying a selection of services from among a plurality of services that are offered for said call according to said caller profile (col. 20, ll. 33-49, variety of services selection based on profile).

Regarding claim 4, Farris teaches of the method wherein said authenticated caller identity is authenticated by a voice utterance of said caller (col. 19, ll. 26-40; col. 19, ll. 65-col. 20, ll. 5).

Regarding claim 5, Farris teaches of the method wherein brokering a connection further comprises:

transmitting a request for said caller identity authentication service via a signal gateway to a network for accessing said external server (col. 19, ll. 16-40, SCP instructing IP);

transferring a prompt for a voice utterance, received from said external server via a media gateway, to said origin device (col. 19, ll. 41-43);

transferring a voice utterance by said caller through said media gateway to said network for accessing said external server (col. 19, ll. 43-46); and

receiving said authenticated caller identity via said signal gateway at said trusted telephone network (col. 20, ll. 14-22).

Regarding claim 6, Farris teaches of the method wherein brokering a connection further comprises:

brokering a secure connection between said trusted telephone network and said external server (Fig. 1, SCP, STP, SSP and IP are connected by SS7, T1, PRI, SMDI etc. which are secure telephony networks as is known in the art).

Regarding claim 7, Farris teaches of a system for specifying telephone services for a particular caller, comprising:

a trusted telephone network for providing service to an origin telephony device (Fig. 1 items 1, 11, 15, 19, 21; col. 18, ll. 1-14);

means for detecting a call initiation condition from said origin telephony device at said trusted telephone network (Fig. 1 item 11; col. 18, ll. 8-14);

means for brokering a connection between said origin device and a server external to said trusted telephone network to perform a caller identity authentication service (Fig. 1 item 11 CO brokering connection from item 1 telephone to item 23 external IP server; col. 18, ll. 22-col. 19, ll. 5);

means responsive to receiving an authenticated caller identity of a caller utilizing said origin telephony device from said server, for specifying services available to said caller according to said authenticated caller identity (Fig. 1 item 23; col. 20, ll. 6-49, IP authenticating caller and providing virtual ID of authenticated caller which is used to load specific subscriber service profile).

Farris is silent on terming the IP providing authentication service as being external server, and the Applicant has relied on Farris col. 11, ll. 1-4 where Farris notes that "The preferred telephone network also includes one or more intelligent peripherals (IPs) 23 to provide enhanced announcement and digits collection capabilities and speech recognition" to argue that the IP providing authentication service in Farris is not an external server. The functionalities of announcements and digit collection for automatic call completion to a retrieved telephone number by a directory assistance

center are common in the third party provided service like directory assistance. The third party server providing directory assistance is *included in the telephone network* for providing service to its customers *but still is external server* not owned and operated by the telephone service provider operating the trusted telephone network. Thus, providing a particular service by an intelligent peripheral is not an indicator to show the inclusion or exclusion of the peripheral in a network. The externality of IP as external server is further evident from the Farris' disclosure that SCP specifically communicates with IP over separate signaling network 27 (TCP/IP network) (Farris, col. 11, ll. 21-30; col. 19, ll. 16-24) in contrast to SCP communicating with other trusted telephone network components like SSP, STP over trusted network of CCIS using SS7 protocols (Farris, col. 9, ll. 20-55), and Farris does not teach of a means for automatically initiating recording of said call in response to lack of identity as indicated by authenticated caller identity.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Bajwa teaches of a trusted telephone network for providing service to an origin telephony device (Fig. 1; Fig. 2 items Telephone and 211); means for detecting a call initiation condition from an origin device at a trusted telephone network (Paragraph 0018 central office receiving call); means for brokering connection between origin device and an external server to perform caller identity authentication service (Paragraphs 0018-0019 call is connected to feature platform); means responsive to receiving an authenticated identity of a caller utilizing said origin telephony device from said server, for specifying services available to said caller according to said authenticated caller identity (Paragraphs 0019-0020, 0022,

0024-0030, provide authentication service from a feature server (an external server) to provide various services based on user or user device authentication).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Farris to provide means for user authentication and other services based on this user authentication from a central feature server as taught by Bajwa in order to “provide the functionality of feature services such as authentication without the cost and complexity of duplicating resources in multiple places" (Bajwa, Paragraph 0007) so that it "allows each of the gateways to be less complex and easier to maintain" and "It is easier to change one or more centralized locations rather than each of the gateways in the system for modifications, upgrade, maintenance and expansion” (Bajwa, Paragraph 0017).

Farris and Bajwa do not teach of means to automatically initiate recording of call in response to lack of identity as indicated by authenticated caller identity.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Bassenyemukasa teaches of a means of detecting a call initiation condition from an origin device at a trusted telephone network (col. 5 ll. 61-66); means for brokering connection between origin device and an external server to perform caller identity authentication service (col. 5 ll. 38-42 connection from originating line to stand-alone external adjunct); means responsive to receiving, from said external server, an authenticated caller identity of caller utilizing said origin device, specifying services available to said caller according to said authenticated caller identity (col. 5 ll. 64-col. 6 ll. 3 monitoring caller voice to indicate “valid” or “not valid”; col. 7 ll. 10-62 different call services); and means responsive to said caller identity indicating a

lack of identity (authenticated as lacking a valid identity), automatically initiating recording of said call (col. 7 ll. 21-36).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Farris and Bajwa with means to initiate recording of a call when the user is identified as lacking valid identity as taught by Bassenyemukasa in order to “monitor a conversation in a delayed mode where the conversation is stored and subject to later analysis for fraudulent use of the phone line" (Bassenyemukasa, col. 7 ll. 60-62).

Regarding claim 8, Farris teaches of the system, wherein said server is accessible via a network outside said trusted telephone network (Fig. 1, item 23, IP is outside of network and is accessed via T1, SMDI or PRI; col. 11, ll. 10-20, ll. 42-54). Bajwa teaches of feature server accessible via network outside trusted telephone network (Paragraph 0018-0020).

Regarding claim 9, Farris teaches of the system further comprising:

means retrieving a caller profile for said authenticated caller identity (col. 20, ll. 6-49, IP authenticating caller and providing virtual ID which is used to load specific subscriber service profile); and

means for specifying a selection of services from among a plurality of services that are offered for said call according to said caller profile (col. 20, ll. 33-49, variety of services selection based on profile).

Regarding claim 10, Farris teaches of the system, wherein said authenticated caller identity is authenticated by a voice utterance of said caller (col. 19, ll. 26-40; col. 19, ll. 65-col. 20, ll. 5).

Regarding claim 11, Farris teaches of the system, wherein said means for brokering a connection further comprises:

means for transmitting a request for said caller identity authentication service via a signal gateway to a network for accessing said external server (col. 19, ll. 16-40, SCP instructing IP);

means for transferring a prompt for a voice utterance, received from said external server via a media gateway, to said origin device (col. 19, ll. 41-43);

means for transferring a voice utterance by said caller through said media gateway to said network for accessing said external server (col. 19, ll. 43-46); and

means for receiving said authenticated caller identity via said signal gateway at said trusted telephone network (col. 20, ll. 14-22).

Regarding claim 12, Farris teaches of a computer program product for specifying telephone services for a particular caller, comprising:

a recording medium (Fig. 2; col. 14 ll. 23-col. 15 ll. 62);

means, recorded on said recording medium, for detecting a call initiation condition from an origin telephony device at a trusted telephone network (Fig. 1 item 11; col. 18, ll. 8-14);

means, recorded on said recording medium, for brokering a connection between said origin device and a server external to said trusted telephone network to perform a

caller identity authentication service (Fig. 1 item 11 CO brokering connection from item 1 telephone to item 23 external IP server; col. 18, ll. 22-col. 19, ll. 5);

means, recorded on said recording medium, for specifying services available to said caller according to an authenticated caller identity received from said server to identify a caller utilizing said origin telephony device (Fig. 1 item 23; col. 20, ll. 6-49, IP authenticating caller and providing virtual ID of authenticated caller which is used to load specific subscriber service profile).

Farris is silent on terming the IP providing authentication service as being external server, and the Applicant has relied on Farris col. 11, ll. 1-4 where Farris notes that "The preferred telephone network also includes one or more intelligent peripherals (IPs) 23 to provide enhanced announcement and digits collection capabilities and speech recognition" to argue that the IP providing authentication service in Farris is not an external server. The functionalities of announcements and digit collection for automatic call completion to a retrieved telephone number by a directory assistance center are common in the third party provided service like directory assistance. The third party server providing directory assistance is *included in the telephone network* for providing service to its customers *but still is external server* not owned and operated by the telephone service provider operating the trusted telephone network. Thus, providing a particular service by an intelligent peripheral is not an indicator to show the inclusion or exclusion of the peripheral in a network. The externality of IP as external server is further evident from the Farris' disclosure that SCP specifically communicates with IP over separate signaling network 27 (TCP/IP network) (Farris, col. 11, ll. 21-30; col. 19,

ll. 16-24) in contrast to SCP communicating with other trusted telephone network components like SSP, STP over trusted network of CCIS using SS7 protocols (Farris, col. 9, ll. 20-55), and Farris does not teach of means recorded on said recording medium for automatically initiating recording of said call in response to lack of identity as indicated by authenticated caller identity.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Bajwa teaches of a means recorded on said recording medium (Paragraphs 0015-0016 the elements using stored program to provide functions as was well known in the art) for detecting a call initiation condition from an origin device at a trusted telephone network (Paragraph 0018 central office receiving call); for brokering connection between origin device and an external server to perform caller identity authentication service (Paragraphs 0018-0019 call is connected to feature platform); for specifying services available to said caller according to an authenticated caller identity received from said server to identify a caller utilizing said origin telephony device (Paragraphs 0019-0020, 0022, 0024-0030, provide authentication service from a feature server (an external server) to provide various services based on user or user device authentication).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Farris with means recorded on recording medium to provide user authentication and other services based on this user authentication from a central feature server as taught by Bajwa in order to “provide the functionality of feature services such as authentication without the cost and complexity of duplicating resources in multiple places" (Bajwa, Paragraph 0007) so that it "allows each of the gateways to

be less complex and easier to maintain" and "It is easier to change one or more centralized locations rather than each of the gateways in the system for modifications, upgrade, maintenance and expansion" (Bajwa, Paragraph 0017).

Farris and Bajwa do not teach of means recorded on said recording medium to automatically initiate recording of call in response to lack of identity as indicated by authenticated caller identity.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Bassenyemukasa teaches of a means recorded on a recording medium (col. 5 ll. 1-15; also PBX as stored program control system) for detecting a call initiation condition from an origin device at a trusted telephone network (col. 5 ll. 61-66); for brokering connection between origin device and an external server to perform caller identity authentication service (col. 5 ll. 38-42 connection from originating line to stand-alone external adjunct); for specifying services available to said caller according to an authenticated caller identity received from said server to identify a caller utilizing said origin telephony device (col. 5 ll. 64-col. 6 ll. 3 monitoring caller voice to indicate "valid" or "not valid"; col. 7 ll. 10-62 different call services); and means responsive to said caller identity indicating a lack of identity (authenticated as lacking a valid identity), automatically initiating recording of said call (col. 7 ll. 21-36).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Farris and Bajwa with means recorded on recording medium to initiate recording of a call when the user is identified as lacking valid identity as taught by Bassenyemukasa in order to "monitor a conversation in a delayed mode

where the conversation is stored and subject to later analysis for fraudulent use of the phone line" (Bassenyemukasa, col. 7 ll. 60-62).

Regarding claim 13, Farris teaches of a method for informing a callee of a caller identity, comprising:

detecting a call initiation condition from an origin device at a trusted telephone network (col. 18, ll. 8-14);

brokering a connection between said origin device and an external server enabled to perform a caller identity authentication service (col. 18, ll. 22-col. 19, ll. 5, switch brokering connection between off hook line and IP);

responsive to receiving, from said external server, an authenticated caller identity of a caller utilizing said origin device, transferring said authenticated caller identity to a destination device, such that a callee receiving said call at said destination device is provided with an identity of a party originating said call (col. 20, ll. 6-32, IP authenticating caller and providing virtual ID; col. 21, ll. 36-col. 22, ll. 28, terminating office receives and delivers caller ID to called party line).

Farris is silent on terming the IP providing authentication service as being external server, and the Applicant has relied on Farris col. 11, ll. 1-4 where Farris notes that "The preferred telephone network also includes one or more intelligent peripherals (IPs) 23 to provide enhanced announcement and digits collection capabilities and speech recognition" to argue that the IP providing authentication service in Farris is not an external server. The functionalities of announcements and digit collection for automatic call completion to a retrieved telephone number by a directory assistance

center are common in the third party provided service like directory assistance. The third party server providing directory assistance is *included in the telephone network* for providing service to its customers *but still is external server* not owned and operated by the telephone service provider operating the trusted telephone network. Thus, providing a particular service by an intelligent peripheral is not an indicator to show the inclusion or exclusion of the peripheral in a network. The externality of IP as external server is further evident from the Farris' disclosure that SCP specifically communicates with IP over separate signaling network 27 (TCP/IP network) (Farris, col. 11, ll. 21-30; col. 19, ll. 16-24) in contrast to SCP communicating with other trusted telephone network components like SSP, STP over trusted network of CCIS using SS7 protocols (Farris, col. 9, ll. 20-55), and Farris does not teach of automatically initiating recording of said call in response to lack of identity as indicated by authenticated caller identity.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Bajwa teaches of detecting a call initiation condition from an origin device at a trusted telephone network (Paragraph 0018 central office receiving call); brokering connection between origin device and an external server to perform caller identity authentication service (Paragraphs 0018-0019 call is connected to feature platform); responsive to receiving, from said external server, an authenticated caller identity of a caller utilizing said origin device, transferring said authenticated caller identity to a destination device, such that a callee receiving said call at said destination device is provided with an identity of a party originating said call (Paragraphs 0019-0020, 0022, 0024-0030, provide authentication service from a feature

server (an external server); provide caller ID and used for call back, call screening services by subscriber).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Farris to provide user authentication and other services based on this user authentication from a central feature server as taught by Bajwa in order to “provide the functionality of feature services such as authentication without the cost and complexity of duplicating resources in multiple places" (Bajwa, Paragraph 0007) so that it "allows each of the gateways to be less complex and easier to maintain" and "It is easier to change one or more centralized locations rather than each of the gateways in the system for modifications, upgrade, maintenance and expansion” (Bajwa, Paragraph 0017).

Farris and Bajwa do not teach of automatically initiating recording of call in response to lack of identity as indicated by authenticated caller identity.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Bassenyemukasa teaches of detecting a call initiation condition from an origin device at a trusted telephone network (col. 5 ll. 61-66); brokering connection between origin device and an external server to perform caller identity authentication service (col. 5 ll. 38-42 connection from originating line to stand-alone external adjunct); receiving, from said external server, an authenticated caller identity of a caller utilizing said origin device (col. 5 ll. 64-col. 6 ll. 3 monitoring caller voice to indicate “valid” or “not valid”); and responsive to said caller identity indicating a lack of identity (authenticated as lacking a valid identity), automatically initiating recording of said call (col. 7 ll. 21-36).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Farris and Bajwa to initiate recording of a call when the user is identified as lacking valid identity as taught by Bassenyemukasa in order to "monitor a conversation in a delayed mode where the conversation is stored and subject to later analysis for fraudulent use of the phone line" (Bassenyemukasa, col. 7 ll. 60-62).

Regarding claim 14, Farris teaches of the method further comprising:

filtering content of said authenticated caller identity before transfer to said destination device (col. 22, ll. 41-51, terminating office receives name and number of caller but delivers only partial data of name).

Regarding claim 15, Farris teaches of the method further comprising:

filtering content of said authenticated caller identity according to filtering preferences associated with said authenticated caller identity (col. 21, ll. 3-52, using calling subscriber profile to provide name for caller identity instead of using it from LIDB).

Regarding claim 16, Farris teaches of the system further comprising:

filtering content of said authenticated caller identity according to an identity of said callee (col. 22, ll. 28-51, filtering authenticated caller ID based on called party).

Regarding claim 17, Farris teaches of the method further comprising:

filtering said authenticated caller identity to block at least a portion of the content of said authenticated caller identity (col. 22, ll. 41-51, terminating office receives name and number of caller but delivers only partial data of name).

Regarding claim 19, Farris teaches of a system for informing a callee of a caller identity, comprising:

a trusted telephone network for enabling telephone service (Fig. 1 items 1, 11, 15, 19, 21; col. 18, ll. 1-14);

means for detecting a call initiation condition from an origin device at said trusted telephone network (Fig. 1 item 11; col. 18, ll. 8-14);

means for brokering a connection between said origin device and an external server enabled to perform a caller identity authentication service (Fig. 1 item 11 CO brokering connection from item 1 telephone to item 23 external IP server; col. 18, ll. 22-col. 19, ll. 5);

means responsive to receiving an authenticated caller identity of a caller utilizing said origin device from said external server, for transferring said authenticated caller identity to a destination device to identify said caller to a call (Fig. 1 item 23; col. 20, ll. 6-49, IP authenticating caller and providing virtual ID of authenticated caller which is used to load specific subscriber service profile; col. 21, ll. 36-col. 22, ll. 28, terminating office receives and delivers caller ID to called party line).

Farris is silent on terming the IP providing authentication service as being external server, and the Applicant has relied on Farris col. 11, ll. 1-4 where Farris notes that "The preferred telephone network also includes one or more intelligent peripherals (IPs) 23 to provide enhanced announcement and digits collection capabilities and speech recognition" to argue that the IP providing authentication service in Farris is not an external server. The functionalities of announcements and digit collection for

automatic call completion to a retrieved telephone number by a directory assistance center are common in the third party provided service like directory assistance. The third party server providing directory assistance is *included in the telephone network* for providing service to its customers *but still is external server* not owned and operated by the telephone service provider operating the trusted telephone network. Thus, providing a particular service by an intelligent peripheral is not an indicator to show the inclusion or exclusion of the peripheral in a network. The externality of IP as external server is further evident from the Farris' disclosure that SCP specifically communicates with IP over separate signaling network 27 (TCP/IP network) (Farris, col. 11, ll. 21-30; col. 19, ll. 16-24) in contrast to SCP communicating with other trusted telephone network components like SSP, STP over trusted network of CCIS using SS7 protocols (Farris, col. 9, ll. 20-55), and Farris does not teach of a means for automatically initiating recording of said call in response to lack of identity as indicated by authenticated caller identity.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Bajwa teaches of a trusted telephone network for providing service to an origin telephony device (Fig. 1; Fig. 2 items Telephone and 211); means for detecting a call initiation condition from an origin device at a trusted telephone network (Paragraph 0018 central office receiving call); means for brokering connection between origin device and an external server to perform caller identity authentication service (Paragraphs 0018-0019 call is connected to feature platform); means responsive to receiving an authenticated caller identity of a caller utilizing said origin device from said external server, for transferring said authenticated

caller identity to a destination device to identify said caller to a call (Paragraphs 0019-0020, 0022, 0024-0030, provide authentication service from a feature server (an external server); provide caller ID and used for call back, call screening services by subscriber).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Farris to provide means for user authentication and other services based on this user authentication from a central feature server as taught by Bajwa in order to “provide the functionality of feature services such as authentication without the cost and complexity of duplicating resources in multiple places" (Bajwa, Paragraph 0007) so that it "allows each of the gateways to be less complex and easier to maintain" and "It is easier to change one or more centralized locations rather than each of the gateways in the system for modifications, upgrade, maintenance and expansion” (Bajwa, Paragraph 0017).

Farris and Bajwa do not teach of means to automatically initiate recording of call in response to lack of identity as indicated by authenticated caller identity.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Bassenyemukasa teaches of a means of detecting a call initiation condition from an origin device at a trusted telephone network (col. 5 ll. 61-66); means for brokering connection between origin device and an external server to perform caller identity authentication service (col. 5 ll. 38-42 connection from originating line to stand-alone external adjunct); means for receiving, from said external server, an authenticated caller identity of caller utilizing said origin device (col. 5 ll. 64-col. 6 ll. 3 monitoring caller voice to indicate “valid” or “not valid”; col. 7 ll. 10-62 different

call services); and means responsive to said caller identity indicating a lack of identity (authenticated as lacking a valid identity), automatically initiating recording of said call (col. 7 ll. 21-36).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Farris and Bajwa with means to initiate recording of a call when the user is identified as lacking valid identity as taught by Bassenyemukasa in order to “monitor a conversation in a delayed mode where the conversation is stored and subject to later analysis for fraudulent use of the phone line" (Bassenyemukasa, col. 7 ll. 60-62).

Regarding claim 20, Farris teaches of the system further comprising:

means for filtering content of said authenticated caller identity before transfer to said destination device (col. 22, ll. 41-51, terminating office receives name and number of caller but delivers only partial data of name).

Regarding claim 21, Farris teaches of the method further comprising:

means for filtering content of said authenticated caller identity according to filtering preferences associated with said authenticated caller identity (col. 21, ll. 3-52, using calling subscriber profile to provide name for caller identity instead of using it from LIDB).

Regarding claim 22, Farris teaches of the system further comprising:

means for filtering content of said authenticated caller identity according to an identity of said callee (col. 22, ll. 28-51, filtering authenticated caller ID based on called party).

Regarding claim 23, Farris teaches of the system further comprising:

means for filtering said authenticated caller identity to block at least a portion of the content of said authenticated caller identity (col. 22, ll. 41-51, terminating office receives name and number of caller but delivers only partial data of name).

Regarding claim 25, Farris teaches of a computer program product for informing a callee of a caller identity, comprising:

a recording medium (Fig. 2; col. 14 ll. 23-col. 15 ll. 62);

means, recorded on said recording medium, for detecting a call initiation condition from an origin device at a trusted telephone network (Fig. 1 item 11; col. 18, ll. 8-14);

means, recorded on said recording medium, for brokering a connection between said origin device and an server external enabled to perform a caller identity authentication service (Fig. 1 item 11 CO brokering connection from item 1 telephone to item 23 external IP server; col. 18, ll. 22-col. 19, ll. 5);

means, recorded on said recording medium, for transferring an authenticated caller identity received from said external server to a destination device to identify said caller utilizing said origin device (Fig. 1 item 23; col. 20, ll. 6-49, IP authenticating caller and providing virtual ID of authenticated caller which is used to load specific subscriber service profile; col. 21, ll. 36-col. 22, ll. 28, terminating office receives and delivers caller ID to called party line).

Farris is silent on terming the IP providing authentication service as being external server, and the Applicant has relied on Farris col. 11, ll. 1-4 where Farris notes

that "The preferred telephone network also includes one or more intelligent peripherals (IPs) 23 to provide enhanced announcement and digits collection capabilities and speech recognition" to argue that the IP providing authentication service in Farris is not an external server. The functionalities of announcements and digit collection for automatic call completion to a retrieved telephone number by a directory assistance center are common in the third party provided service like directory assistance. The third party server providing directory assistance is *included in the telephone network* for providing service to its customers *but still is external server* not owned and operated by the telephone service provider operating the trusted telephone network. Thus, providing a particular service by an intelligent peripheral is not an indicator to show the inclusion or exclusion of the peripheral in a network. The externality of IP as external server is further evident from the Farris' disclosure that SCP specifically communicates with IP over separate signaling network 27 (TCP/IP network) (Farris, col. 11, ll. 21-30; col. 19, ll. 16-24) in contrast to SCP communicating with other trusted telephone network components like SSP, STP over trusted network of CCIS using SS7 protocols (Farris, col. 9, ll. 20-55), and Farris does not teach of means recorded on said recording medium for automatically initiating recording of said call in response to lack of identity as indicated by authenticated caller identity.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Bajwa teaches of a means recorded on said recording medium (Paragraphs 0015-0016 the elements using stored program to provide functions as was well known in the art) for detecting a call initiation condition from an origin device at a trusted telephone network (Paragraph 0018 central office

receiving call); for brokering connection between origin device and an external server to perform caller identity authentication service (Paragraphs 0018-0019 call is connected to feature platform); for transferring an authenticated caller identity received from said external server to a destination device to identify said caller utilizing said origin device (Paragraphs 0019-0020, 0022, 0024-0030, provide authentication service from a feature server (an external server); provide caller ID and used for call back, call screening services by subscriber).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Farris with means recorded on recording medium to provide user authentication and other services based on this user authentication from a central feature server as taught by Bajwa in order to “provide the functionality of feature services such as authentication without the cost and complexity of duplicating resources in multiple places" (Bajwa, Paragraph 0007) so that it "allows each of the gateways to be less complex and easier to maintain" and "It is easier to change one or more centralized locations rather than each of the gateways in the system for modifications, upgrade, maintenance and expansion” (Bajwa, Paragraph 0017).

Farris and Bajwa do not teach of means recorded on said recording medium for automatically initiating recording of call in response to lack of identity as indicated by authenticated caller identity.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Bassenyemukasa teaches of a means recorded on a recording medium (col. 5 ll. 1-15; also PBX as stored program control system) for detecting a call initiation condition from an origin device at a trusted

telephone network (col. 5 ll. 61-66); for brokering connection between origin device and an external server to perform caller identity authentication service (col. 5 ll. 38-42 connection from originating line to stand-alone external adjunct); for specifying services available to said caller according to an authenticated caller identity received from said server to identify a caller utilizing said origin telephony device (col. 5 ll. 64-col. 6 ll. 3 monitoring caller voice to indicate “valid” or “not valid”; col. 7 ll. 10-62 different call services); and means responsive to said caller identity indicating a lack of identity (authenticated as lacking a valid identity), automatically initiating recording of said call (col. 7 ll. 21-36).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Farris and Bajwa with means recorded on recording medium to initiate recording of a call when the user is identified as lacking valid identity as taught by Bassenyemukasa in order to “monitor a conversation in a delayed mode where the conversation is stored and subject to later analysis for fraudulent use of the phone line" (Bassenyemukasa, col. 7 ll. 60-62).

Regarding claim 26, Farris teaches of the computer program product further comprising:

means, recorded on said recording medium, for filtering content of said authenticated caller identity before transfer to said destination device (col. 22, ll. 41-51, terminating office receives name and number of caller but delivers only partial data of name).

Regarding claim 27, Farris teaches of the computer program product further comprising:

means, recorded on said recording medium, for filtering content of said authenticated caller identity according to filtering preferences associated with said authenticated caller identity (col. 21, ll. 3-52, using calling subscriber profile to provide name for caller identity instead of using it from LIDB).

Regarding claim 28, Farris teaches of the computer program product further comprising:

means, recorded on said recording medium, for filtering content of said authenticated caller identity according to an identity of said callee (col. 22, ll. 28-51, filtering authenticated caller ID based on called party).

Regarding claim 29, Farris teaches of the computer program product further comprising:

means, recorded on said recording medium, for filtering said authenticated caller identity to block at least a portion of the content of said authenticated caller identity (col. 22, ll. 41-51, terminating office receives name and number of caller but delivers only partial data of name).

Regarding claim 32, Farris teaches of a method comprising:

receiving, at a telephony device, a secure communication channel via a trusted telephone network to an authentication service, wherein said trusted telephone network initiates said authentication service provided by an external server (col. 18, ll. 7-col. 19, ll. 47; CO initiating authentication service performed by external server IP wherein SCP

and IP communicate over external network i.e. Internet, also col. 17, ll. 24-30; and col. 20, ll. 6-32, IP returns authenticated identity); and

facilitating, from said telephony device, communications between said authentication service and a caller, such that said authentication service is enabled to authenticate an identity of said caller (col. 19, ll. 16-col. 20, ll. 32).

Farris is silent on terming the IP providing authentication service as being external server, and the Applicant has relied on Farris col. 11, ll. 1-4 where Farris notes that "The preferred telephone network also includes one or more intelligent peripherals (IPs) 23 to provide enhanced announcement and digits collection capabilities and speech recognition" to argue that the IP providing authentication service in Farris is not an external server. The functionalities of announcements and digit collection for automatic call completion to a retrieved telephone number by a directory assistance center are common in the third party provided service like directory assistance. The third party server providing directory assistance is *included in the telephone network* for providing service to its customers *but still is external server* not owned and operated by the telephone service provider operating the trusted telephone network. Thus, providing a particular service by an intelligent peripheral is not an indicator to show the inclusion or exclusion of the peripheral in a network. The externality of IP as external server is further evident from the Farris' disclosure that SCP specifically communicates with IP over separate signaling network 27 (TCP/IP network) (Farris, col. 11, ll. 21-30; col. 19, ll. 16-24) in contrast to SCP communicating with other trusted telephone network components like SSP, STP over trusted network of CCIS using SS7 protocols (Farris,

col. 9, ll. 20-55), and Farris does not teach of automatically initiating recording of said call in response to lack of identity as indicated by authenticated caller identity.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Bajwa teaches of a method of receiving, at a telephony device, a secure communication channel via a trusted telephone network to an authentication service, wherein said trusted telephone network initiates said authentication service provided by an external server (Paragraphs 0018-0019 call received through central office; call is connected to external feature platform server to initiate authentication); facilitating, from said telephony device, communications between said authentication service and a caller, such that said authentication service is enabled to authenticate an identity of said caller (Paragraphs 0018-0020; feature platform server performing authentication by prompting caller and getting responses).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Farris to provide user authentication and other services based on this user authentication from a central feature server as taught by Bajwa in order to “provide the functionality of feature services such as authentication without the cost and complexity of duplicating resources in multiple places" (Bajwa, Paragraph 0007) so that it "allows each of the gateways to be less complex and easier to maintain" and "It is easier to change one or more centralized locations rather than each of the gateways in the system for modifications, upgrade, maintenance and expansion” (Bajwa, Paragraph 0017).

Farris and Bajwa do not teach of automatically initiating recording of call in response to lack of identity as indicated by authenticated caller identity.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Bassenyemukasa teaches of a method of receiving, at a telephony device, a secure communication channel via a trusted telephone network to an authentication service, wherein said trusted telephone network initiates said authentication service provided by an external server (col. 5 ll. 61-66; connection from originating line to stand-alone external adjunct); facilitating, from said telephony device, communications between said authentication service and a caller, such that said authentication service is enabled to authenticate an identity of said caller (col. 5 ll. 64-col. 6 ll. 3 monitoring caller voice to indicate “valid” or “not valid”); and responsive to said caller identity indicating a lack of identity (authenticated as lacking a valid identity), automatically initiating recording of said call (col. 7 ll. 21-36).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Farris and Bajwa to initiate recording of a call when the user is identified as lacking valid identity as taught by Bassenyemukasa in order to “monitor a conversation in a delayed mode where the conversation is stored and subject to later analysis for fraudulent use of the phone line" (Bassenyemukasa, col. 7 ll. 60-62).

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Patent No. 6,327,343 Epstein

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HEMANT PATEL whose telephone number is (571)272-8620. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on 571-272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Fan Tsang/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2614

Hemant Patel
Examiner
Art Unit 2614

HSP